

# THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, JANUARY, 1912

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, South Dakota, Connecticut, Maryland, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,  
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Forty-one Branch Committees; 16,083\* members in 349 cities, towns, and villages.

MISS MARY S. AMES, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,  
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,  
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,  
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,  
MISS AGNES IRWIN,  
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,

Vice-Presidents.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,  
Walnut Street, Brookline.  
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.  
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.  
Room 615 Kensington Building,  
Boston.

\* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the State

## A NATIONAL ANTI-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

THE most important measure yet taken to make more effective the opposition of the great mass of the conservative women of the United States to woman suffrage, is the formation of a National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

The Association was formed November 28, at 563 Park Avenue, New York City, at a meeting of delegates from Associations and Committees from various states. There was a general agreement upon the necessity of a national organization of women for more concerted opposition to woman suffrage measures, for the organization of local sentiment against such measures when in-

troduced in legislatures, and for the strengthening and assistance of state associations already existing or which may hereafter be formed. The following officers were chosen:

President: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York; Vice Presidents: Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Massachusetts; Mrs. Horace Brock, Pennsylvania; Treasurer: Mrs. Robert Garrett, Maryland; Secretary: Mrs. Roland G. Hazard, Rhode Island; Executive Committee: Mrs. W. A. Putnam, New York; Miss Mary S. Ames, Massachusetts; Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Roland G. Hazard, Rhode Island; Mrs. Daniel Markham, Connecticut; Mrs. C. F. Corbin, Illinois; Mrs. Francis J. Bailey, Oregon; Mrs. C. L. Goddard, San Francisco; Mrs. George L. A. Caswell, Los Angeles; Mrs. Robert McVickar, New York.

As Mrs. Hazard was unable to serve as Secretary, the Executive Committee was empowered to fill that office. The temporary headquarters of the Association are at 29 West 39th St., New York City.

## SUFFRAGE IN CALIFORNIA

It would be foolish for the opponents of woman suffrage to lose heart because of the ratification of the suffrage amendment in California last October.

California was swept last year by a wave of radicalism. The legislature submitted to the people no less than twenty-three amendments to the constitution, to be voted on at the same election. All of them were adopted, most of them by overwhelming majorities. But the vote on the suffrage amendment was so close that the result was for several days in doubt. So narrow was the margin that the change of a single vote to a precinct would have defeated the amendment.

The majority in favor of the initiative-referendum amendment was

116,651; that in favor of the recall, including the judiciary, was 124,360. But the majority for the woman suffrage amendment was only 3,587. That an electorate which adopted the initiative-referendum and the recall by such enormous majorities should hesitate to adopt woman suffrage shows that the suffrage experiment makes even the extreme radicals pause.

That the suffrage amendment came so near defeat is due largely to the energetic and well-directed efforts of the Associations of women in southern and northern California, organized to oppose the amendment. Even in defeat, these Associations have nothing with which to reproach themselves. They made a good fight, and under normal conditions they would have succeeded.

## HARVARD AND MRS. PANKHURST

A GREAT deal of intemperate and silly criticism has been directed against the authorities of Harvard University because they refused to permit the use of Sanders Theatre last month for an address by Mrs. Pankhurst.

What would these critics have? Do they conceive it to be the duty of the University to open its chief place of assembly to whoever may ask for it? Suppose some students' club had been seized with a desire to hear some notorious anarchist, should the University have consented to open Sanders Theatre for that purpose?

But Mrs. Pankhurst, it will be said, is not an anarchist. Perhaps not. But she is an apostle of lawlessness. She came first into prominence in England as the originator of the riotous demonstrations of the suffragettes and a leader in them. She has visited this country



for the purpose of urging similar demonstrations on the part of American women, and of collecting large sums of money to promote the English suffragette campaign.

It is not any special gift of eloquence, or any special force in her arguments, but her adoption of this mischievous and unwomanly policy which has given her prominence and notoriety. Unless the authorities of Harvard University were prepared to sanction the placing of individual caprice and wilfulness above the restraints of law, upon which the stability of society depends, no other course was open to them than that which they followed.

#### THE LONDON RIOT

THE REMONSTRANCE prints in another column an account of the suffragette riot in London on the evening of November 21st, quoted from the New York Evening Post, a journal warmly devoted to woman suffrage, and therefore not likely to exaggerate the occurrence. Following this is an account of a disturbance eight days later, when a body of suffragettes, by their noisy demonstrations, prevented Mr. Asquith from delivering an address on social settlement work in one of the London churches, and practically drove him from the platform.

A few days before the suffragette riot described in the New York Evening Post, a deputation of suffragists had waited upon Mr. Asquith to learn from him the attitude of the Government toward the question, in view of the recent introduction of a manhood suffrage bill. Here is a part of Mr. Asquith's reply, as reported in The London Times:

I quite understand Miss Pankhurst's position. She says it is our duty ourselves to introduce a Bill conferring the franchise on women on the same terms as men. (Hear, hear.) I quite understand that, and it is an intelligible position. But we have never promised to do anything of the kind. If you ask why we will not do it, I tell you once more I am the head of the Government, and I

am not going to make myself responsible for the introduction of a measure which I do not conscientiously believe to be demanded in the interests of the country.

MISS PANKHURST. — Then you can go, and we will get another head.

MR. ASQUITH. — I may go if you like. If you can get rid of me well and good.

The remedy lies entirely in your hands, continued the Prime Minister. The Government have nothing to do with it, they stand by and are neutral. The remedy lies in your own hands, and if you can persuade a majority of the members in the present House of Commons in the next Session, either in regard to the Conciliation Bill or in regard to the Reform Bill—for you shall certainly have the opportunity—to introduce into that Bill qualifications for the suffrage for women, if a majority of the House of Commons is prepared to assent to them, I give you my assurance on behalf of the Government that they will accept the decision thus come to, and will forward the measure in one case and give facilities for it in the other. That ought to satisfy you.

From this it appears that Mr. Asquith not only has broken no promise, but is ready to go farther than he at first promised. The National Union of Societies for Woman Suffrage, the largest and most experienced of the women's organizations, accepted this statement as a distinct advance in the situation. It was the Women's Social and Political Union, the organization dominated by Mrs. Pankhurst, which gave vent to its emotions by organized rioting.

#### THE LEDGE AND THE LADDER

A RECENT number of The Woman's Journal displays a large cartoon in which Woman is pictured standing on a narrow ledge marked "Traditional Duties," projecting from a cliff on which, above her head, are the words "Economic Progress." Around and below her yawns a dark abyss labelled "Parasitism." Above her rises a straight, steep ladder, inscribed "World's Labor."

It is a striking picture. Exactly

what is it meant to teach? Obviously that the performance of "traditional duties" does not entitle Woman to rank among the world's laborers. Obviously, that Woman ought to get off the ledge on to the ladder.

Practically, how do the suffragists propose that she shall do it? "Woman's place," says one of them, writing in the Cleveland Press, "is out of the home in the world of labor almost as much as man's. Girls are now generally educated with a view of earning a living outside their home." To be sure they are. But, in spite of their education, they leave the world of labor and return to the home,—the husband's home, this time,—with a promptness to which statistics testify. Girls drop off the ladder before they have gone many rounds up, drop back on to the old ledge of "traditional duties."

What is to be done with them then? How is the married woman to keep her place on the ladder? Evidently some radical readjustment of her relation to the home is involved. Suffragists are not agreed what it shall be. A legal provision requiring a husband to pay his wife definite wages or salary would content some. Others advocate a more complete "economic independence," with the wife a wage-earner after marriage as before.

Here, the care of the children is, of course, a difficulty, not to speak of the disturbance occasioned by their coming; but some enthusiasts meet it easily by a proposal for state nurseries and periodic vacations. Extremists of the socialist wing maintain that the state should subsidize mothers, and that maternity should be compensated from the public treasury,—the share of the father in the children's up-bringing being, as Mr. H. G. Wells naively says, a matter of detail upon which opinion may vary.

Earnest suffragists of the conservative school have honestly believed that Woman Suffrage involved no risk to the home. Can they keep on believing it? There was room for



the home,—narrow and straitened sometimes, no doubt,—on the ledge. Is there any room for it on the ladder?

#### WOMEN AS LEGISLATORS

THE Woman's Journal of December 9, under the characteristically gentle heading "Another Colorado Slander Nailed" denounces the article in the REMONSTRANCE for October regarding the vote of the women members of the Colorado legislature upon the race-track gambling bill.

But the facts in this matter are precisely as THE REMONSTRANCE stated them. The Woman's Journal, in fact, does not deny them, but seeks to befog them. THE REMONSTRANCE was slow to believe that all four of the women in the Colorado legislature could have voted for this iniquitous bill. It did not accept the newspaper reports to that effect; but caused an investigation to be made of the official records of the Colorado House. There the names of all four women were found among those who voted for the bill.

It is true that, after the stinging rebuke in Governor Shafroth's veto message, in which he said that if this bill became law "the finger of scorn and ridicule would ever after be pointed at the influence of woman's franchise in state affairs" the women abandoned their support of the bill as did many of the men; and even averred that they had not fully understood its purport. But the essential fact remains that they all voted for the bill, and that, except for the courageous action of Governor Shafroth, it would have become a law with the aid of their votes.

Apparently as an argument in extenuation, the article in The Woman's Journal says that three of these women "were nominated by the local bossridden Democratic party" of Denver. But, if women legislators are to be the tools of bosses and are to vote for iniquitous bills at their

bidding, what becomes of the claim that women will purify politics?

#### NOT THE DAY FOR THE DOVE

THE Woman's Journal displayed its usual symbol of a suffrage victory—the dove—over the paragraph announcing that the women teachers of New York city have gained what they have long been struggling for,—equal pay with men teachers doing similar work.

But The Woman's Journal failed to comment upon the most significant feature of this incident,—namely, that the women carried their point without the ballot.

How often have we been told that women must have the ballot before they can hope to secure the correction of any form of injustice? But what becomes of this claim in the light of this incident over which The Woman's Journal mistakenly places its dove?

These New York women were opposed by the men teachers,—who were possessed of the ballot. The change which they asked meant an addition of three and a half million dollars to the city's taxation. Their measure had to run the gauntlet of the Legislature: and afterward it had to have the approval of the Mayor of New York city and the Governor of the state. Yet the women, who did not have the ballot, triumphed over the men who did.

This incident, so far from being something for suffragists to exult over, is simply one more proof that women do not need the ballot to get what they need.

#### TWO SIMPLE QUESTIONS

THERE are two simple questions which legislators who are this year entreated to vote for suffrage measures may well ask themselves.

One is: Would the grant of the ballot be a good thing for women? The other is: Would it be a good thing for the community?

As to the first question, it may be

answered that the majority of American women are intelligent enough to know what is good for them. If they believed that they would be better off with the ballot, they would not fail to ask for it. But they have not asked for it. The suffragists themselves admit that they represent only a minority of their sex. They are, in fact, only a small minority. They are noisy, but they are only a handful, compared with the great mass of American women.

As to the public at large, what possible good can come from forcing the ballot upon women, when they do not want it and have had no training for its use?

If women, average women, were to vote only just as wisely, just as steadily, just as patriotically as men, there would be no gain to the public at large. The electorate would simply have been doubled, with a corresponding doubling of election expenses, without the slightest change in the result.

But, with women reluctant, untrained, and already heavily weighted with responsibilities from which they cannot be relieved, what chance is there that they would vote as wisely and as steadily as men? Still more, what chance is there that they would vote more steadily and more wisely than men, and so bring about a better state of things than now exists?

These are questions which the suffragists do not answer. But legislators should weigh them seriously before giving their votes to suffrage measures.

#### PURE FANCY

(From the Chicago Inter-Ocean, Nov. 2, 1911)

THE cold truth, without fear or favor, is that this idea of the immense mass of feminine ballots, or the notably greater part of it, cohering as a sort of independent moral political factor in public life, going now this way and now that at the behest of lofty motives, and decisively settling questions on the basis of morality, is pure fancy.



"I, AN INDIVIDUAL, AN EGO —"

"I, AN individual, an Ego, alone for all time, I want to vote."

So runs the basic form of argumentation recommended to deep-thinking suffragists in a recent letter from their national headquarters. It reveals at once the extreme individualism with which anti-suffragists have often charged the movement. It clings to the old idea of the vote as a "natural right," not a responsibility laid on those who can best serve the community by exercising it. It claims the vote as a right of the essential being, in terms of the metaphysical world.

If it were only possible for Egos alone-for-all-time to step out into the metaphysical world and exercise their rights, no one would dream of objecting.

But here we are, — together, as it seems to most of us, — not alone in the least. Bound up with each other's concerns. Busied with very practical and concrete matters. Matters that tend to fall into the hands of the Egos that understand them best.

Says the Man-Voter: "Are you in the way of knowing much about railroads, and police, and fire-fighting and engineering and fisheries and shipping and road-making and sewerage and all the other lines of heavy work that government has to do with? Legislation isn't all moral questions, you know. And by the way, can you enforce your laws after you have made them? Or do you expect me to do that?"

"Why should we trouble to talk about that?" says the Suffragist. "I, an Ego, alone for all time, want to vote."

Says the indifferent woman: "I outnumber you, fifty to one. My hands are full now. I say 'no' every day to work that I should like to take up. I think the men of my community with all their faults, are making as good a job of its affairs as I should, — or as you would. If you vote, sooner or later I shall have to."

"What of that?" says the Suffragist.

"I, an Ego, alone for all time, want to vote."

Says the Woman Opposed: "I think more is implied in your 'political equality' than you realize. I am afraid of the views of your extremists as to sex equality. I don't see my way to admire your theories of 'economic independence.' I think an electorate half women would mean an unstable government. Frankly, I face the future for my children with far more courage as things now are than if you were voting."

"All that is very tedious" says the Suffragist. "I, an Ego, alone for all time, want to vote."

Says the Child: "Your friends make me promises. They will protect me from overwork. They will inspect my food. They will have my clothes made in clean places. But what will become of me if my mother must go out to work every day to prove that she is the equal of my father?"

"What business is that of mine?" says the Suffragist. "I, an Ego, alone for all time, want to vote."

#### PLAYING WITH FIRE

UNDER the above heading, Mr. Henry Watterson, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, expressed his views in that paper as follows, upon the adjournment of the National Suffrage Convention, October 24, 1911:

The Courier-Journal will be delighted to join the Christian women of Kentucky in every movement having reason for its basis and the betterment of women for its purpose. But the women who propose to lead such a movement must bring to the discussion unembittered hearts, free and fair minds. They must seek truth, not set up an infallible dogma. They must not play fast and loose with it, now claiming the feminine prerogative of immunity from responsibility and now asserting the man's habit to knock down and drag out, expecting to bulldoze where they cannot wheedle and cajole.

It is a most serious business. If they address themselves to it seriously—as gentle and wise women,

who are still women, and not as self-exploiting females who would be men, and not very attractive men, either—they will undoubtedly reach many beneficent reforms. If they let it get into politics, petticoat politics, they will be lost. Merely to "project" with it is to play with fire. They may take it from us that the late convention left a very bad taste in the masculine mouth. The average man may be too cowardly to tell them so. But the Courier-Journal, which is their friend, and is never afraid to speak the truth, tells them so, because it is the fact.

(From The Boston Herald, Dec. 16, 1911.)

#### MRS. WELLS'S ILLUSTRIOUS EXAMPLE

To the Editor of The Herald:

The Massachusetts Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage desires to express through your columns their high appreciation of Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells as a public-spirited citizen and a faithful friend to all who in her wide acquaintance were in need of her help and sympathy.

The members of this association can testify also to her wise and open minded consideration of the woman suffrage question in its relation to the state, as well as to women themselves. She had the courage of her convictions to an unusual degree. This she showed in the early days of our active work at a hearing held by a special committee of the Massachusetts Legislature in the old green room of the State House. Mrs. Wells was the first woman to address this committee for the remonstrants. George G. Crocker, Esq., Judge John Lowell, Thornton K. Lothrop, Esq., and the Rev. Brooke Herford represented the association during several years, while the committee on woman suffrage still met in the green room. The address made by Mrs. Wells was printed as a leaflet for wide circulation. She has continued to give her help and moral support to the association. While in her own noble way she could do justice to those who held different views, she was ever a loyal friend to the workers in opposition, and they must always miss her active sympathy.

May her convictions and her courage remain their inspiration.

Mrs. Charles Eliot Guild.  
Brookline, Dec. 15.



PUNCH, OR THE LONDON CHARIVARI.—NOVEMBER 29, 1911.



"SERMONS IN STONES."

JOHN BULL (to Non-militant Suffragist). "I COULD LISTEN MORE ATTENTIVELY, MADAM, TO YOUR PLEAS, WERE IT NOT FOR THESE CONCRETE ARGUMENTS WHICH I FIND RATHER DISTRACTING."

**"POLITICS FOR WOMEN"—WHY?**

MRS. SUSAN W. FITZGERALD, Secretary of the Massachusetts Equal Suffrage Association, arguing, in the Boston Traveller, for "Politics for Women" says: "Politics decide how your home shall be protected from fire, how the streets shall be paved, what sidewalks and sewers shall be built, what your telephone rates shall be, how much light and air your home shall have, what your taxes shall be."

What do women know, by practical experience, of the fighting of fires, the construction of streets, sidewalks, sewers, telephone lines, of building regulations and the various public necessities which call for taxes?

Is there any one of these matters in which a man has not as much at stake as a woman? With the same interest, and vastly more practical knowledge, why not leave these things to men?

Mrs. Fitzgerald says again: "Politics decide how your children shall

be protected from the diseases that may come from impure water, bad milk, dirty markets, filthy streets, or other bad hygienic conditions."

But is it only children who need such protection? Do not men need it themselves? Has a man no interest in avoiding typhoid fever? As a matter of fact, are not men,—whether from self-interest or to guard the public welfare,—already covering our statute books with laws relating to sanitation?

A great deal is said about woman's zeal for cleanliness. But is it only women who have such zeal? Is it not a well-known fact that cleanliness in the home and the kitchen is now being taught by the example of cleanliness enforced by doctors in the hospitals? Those only in middle life can remember when kindly women ran back and forth among their neighbors' houses to give help in scarlet fever and diphtheria with scarcely a change of dress between the sick-room and their own nurse-

ries; and when devoted mothers fed to their children milk from cows that loving fathers had watered from wells where drainage oozed in. Those, by the way, were the days to which the would-be reformers look back mournfully when they say that woman no longer has the household health within her own hands, but is at the mercy of tainted milk and infected clothing.

The modern care for health, so powerfully stimulated by scientific discoveries, not yet fifty years old, is still a new thing. It has made wonderful progress in two generations. It is yet imperfect. But to say that it is halting for lack of woman's vote is pure assumption. It would be quite as accurate to say that it halts for lack of woman's cooperation in the home, for her want of care in isolating ailing children, for her neglect of sanitary precautions already perfectly practicable.

In all such discussions, why should it be assumed that it is only the



mothers who care for the welfare of the children? Are not the fathers concerned as well? Do they not love their children? In every one of the matters which Mrs. Fitzgerald enumerates, are they not just as anxious as the mothers are to secure the best possible conditions for their children? And are they not, by reason of their experience, better qualified to deal with all these matters, so far as they are affected by politics, than the mothers are?

#### NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

ACCORDING to the National Headquarters letter in *The Woman's Journal* of November 18, 1911, the national suffragist "dues-paying membership" is only about 28,000. That seems rather a meagre membership for an organization making revolutionary demands upon a nation of 100,000,000 people. But *The Woman's Journal* speaks of "conscious suffragists," leaving it to be imagined that there is a vast number of "unconscious suffragists."

ONE suggestion which Mrs. Pankhurst has been making in her speeches in this country is that American women who want the ballot should refuse to allow their names to be enrolled in the census until they are recognized as voters. As the date of the next census is eight years distant, this will seem to the more ardent suffragists rather a slow method of expressing their displeasure.

AT Seattle, on the 27th of October, a suffragette who was dissatisfied with the decision of a court, horse-whipped the judge. Perhaps she wanted to disprove the argument that women cannot use physical force. Or, perhaps she wanted to show that there is a swifter way than the recall for getting even with an obnoxious judge. In either case, she will probably be reckoned among the most progressive of her type.

THE REMONSTRANCE records with pleasure the initial steps toward

the organization of an anti-suffrage association in Connecticut. There was a meeting at the home of Mrs. A. A. Welsh, 21 Woodland Street, Hartford, November 3d, attended by women from various parts of the state. Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, of Simsbury and New York, presided. A constitution was presented for consideration, a nominating committee was appointed, and it was decided to call the organization the Connecticut Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

THE St. Louis Post-Despatch of October 15, stated editorially that "the legislatures of four states,—Kansas, Oregon, Nevada and Wisconsin—have voted to submit suffrage amendments to the voters in 1912." So far as Nevada is concerned, this is an error. As THE REMONSTRANCE has before stated, the constitution of Nevada requires that proposed amendments shall be approved by two successive legislatures. The Nevada amendment must be acted upon by the legislature elected in 1912 and meeting in 1913, and even if the action of the second legislature is favorable the proposal will not be voted on until November, 1914, unless a special election is called.

THOSE women who have hesitated to commit themselves definitely against woman suffrage, because of a feeling that some restricted form of suffrage,—tax-paying suffrage, for example, or suffrage with a high educational qualification—might not be a bad thing, should not fail to take notice that all half-way measures have been abandoned by the suffragists. Nothing more is heard of tax-paying suffrage, or license suffrage, or educationally-restricted suffrage, or even presidential suffrage. What the suffragists everywhere are pressing for is complete suffrage by the amendment of state constitutions,—the vote for every woman, on all questions and at all elections.

#### GERMAN-AMERICANS AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE

MR. C. A. SOMMER, of Lincoln, Nebraska, one of the delegates from that state at the convention of the German-American Alliance, which met at Washington in October, is authority for the statement that the Alliance has had a remarkable growth during the last two years and that its reports now show a membership of more than two million. Associated with the Alliance is an organization of women's clubs, which already have a membership of about fifteen thousand. These clubs, Mr. Sommer states, have the same standing in the organization as the men's alliances; and they are opposed to woman suffrage. Such clubs of conservative German-American women should have great influence, especially in the West, where the Alliance is strongest.

#### DOES THE BALLOT NEED WOMAN?

(Caroline Ticknor in *Hartford Courant*, Oct. 17, 1911)

THEY, (the militant suffragists) have come out to secure "votes for women" but they do not explain how they intend to benefit their state when they have gained their end. Were they inspired by any preconceived idea of how they are to purify this country's politics, or elevate its public service, they would no doubt set forth their plans and aims. But this they fail to do. The truth is that they do not care what happens to the state, for better or for worse, if only they secure the fancied privileges for which they are clamoring.

"We stand for any party or person who stands for us" is the keynote of the progressive policy being pursued today to further the very narrow ends of these campaigners. They cry out that the ballot is something that the woman ought to have; but they do not stop to ask if, on the other hand, the woman is something that the ballot ought to have.

#### THE DEMAND DOESN'T GROW

(From the *Boston Republic*, Sept. 30, 1911)

WE have always maintained that, in the United States, women will



have votes directly a majority of them demand it. But among us, the demand doesn't grow. The woman wage-earner especially, to whom suffrage is supposed to mean so much, turns wearily from it, and says: "I haven't the strength to spare for the struggle."

(From the New York Evening Post,  
Nov. 22, 1911.)  
**ANOTHER SUFFRAGETTE RIOT  
IN LONDON**

**PROMISCUOUS SMASHING OF WIN-  
DOWS IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC  
BUILDINGS.**

**WOMEN FIGHT THE POLICE AND  
MORE THAN 200 ARE ARRESTED.**

LONDON, Nov. 22—Unrepentant suffragettes to the number of 223, many of whom are apparently still in their teens, appeared at Bow Street Police Court this morning to answer for their rioting of last night, and were sentenced to fines or alternative terms of imprisonment varying from a fortnight to a month. The women invariably chose prison instead of paying a fine.

Counsel for the public prosecutor said, in speaking of the charge, that he could not adequately describe the "disgraceful and discreditable scenes of organized disorder" of which the accused were guilty. From the evidence it is certain that the militant suffragettes acted yesterday on a complete plan of campaign. As soon as they were repulsed by the police drawn up in Parliament Square, they dispersed into small groups, who mixed with the crowds. These were kept in constant movement by the police. Occasionally a missile was hurled from the middle of the throng, but the police were unable to detect the thrower. This gave the militants more confidence, and as they came within reach of the government offices in Whitehall and on the surrounding streets, the throwing of stones became more frequent, and excited shouts of "Votes for women!" were raised. It was here that most of the arrests were effected. Some of the women fought their captors with great vigor.

Skirmishing bands of women made sudden window-breaking raids on government offices and private buildings in different parts of the West End of London. Along Whitehall and Parliament Street stones were hurled through the windows of the War Office, the Admiralty, the Treas-

ury, the Home Office and the Local Government Board Buildings, while the premises of the National Liberal Club came in for special attention.

Mounted men were summoned to help resist the attacks on the ground floor of the Treasury building. In Parliament Street there was hardly a window which escaped attention. The women in many cases offered some resistance, and for more than an hour Parliament Street and Parliament Square were in a state of turmoil.

**MR. ASQUITH SHOUTED DOWN  
Suffragettes Break up a Meeting On  
Settlement Work**

(From the Boston Herald, Nov. 30,  
1911)

LONDON, Nov. 29—In pursuance of their recently revived policy of militant tactics, suffragettes invaded the City Temple tonight and by noisy interruptions prevented Premier Asquith from delivering a speech on settlement work. The premier, after repeated efforts to get a hearing, left the church in disgust.

The trouble began as soon as Mr. Asquith mounted the rostrum. Scores of women who had gained admission to the famous Non-conformist church greeted him with cries of "votes for women." One of their number chained herself to a pillar and was removed only after a violent struggle, during which the audience was in an uproar.

James Ramsay MacDonald, the labor leader, who spoke after Mr. Asquith had left, described the scene as an insult to the prime minister and a degradation of English public life.

#### SUFFRAGISTS AT HARVARD

THE action of the Harvard corporation with reference to Mrs. Pankhurst's lecture has been so copiously and virulently misrepresented that the following statement of what actually occurred deserves a careful reading. It is taken from an editorial article in the Boston Advertiser of December 5:

When the little association of suffragists among the undergraduates went before the corporation with the suggestion that one of the college halls be assigned for the purpose of a lecture by some noted woman suf-

ragist, the corporation made its position perfectly clear. It did not believe, it stated frankly, that there was any great and burning desire on the part of Harvard undergraduates to hear such a lecture. For that reason it decided that while permission would be granted, that permission should not be construed as establishing a precedent that there should be a series of lectures of that kind. The petitioners were instructed to choose their lecturer, and the promise was made that a hall would be assigned.

Accordingly, this was done. The petitioners chose, not Mrs. Pankhurst, but an estimable and able lecturer, who gave her lecture. There were about seventy persons present.

When the petitioners, in spite of the tacit understanding with the corporation, asked that a college hall be assigned for another lecture, the Harvard corporation made its position perfectly plain. If the undergraduates themselves wanted to hear Mrs. Pankhurst, and would allow her the use of the large lecture hall controlled by them, the Harvard corporation said emphatically that it would interpose no objection whatever. It was true that Mrs. Pankhurst's addresses in some other places had been attended with some disorder, but the members of the corporation felt that if the undergraduates invited her to speak, there would be no disorder at the Union.

The representative of the petitioners himself reported to the member of the corporation who had the matter in charge that there appeared to be no desire on the part of the undergraduates to allow Mrs. Pankhurst the use of the hall. The petitioners themselves had already made the choice of their own lecturer, and it had been understood by them that the responsibility for their choice rested with them. They had their lecturer, and they admitted that the body of undergraduates were unwilling to allow Mrs. Pankhurst the privilege of their own lecture hall. The self evident thing to do, in the opinion of the corporation, was for the advocates of suffrage to hire their own lecture hall, under the circumstances.

In view of the fact, thus disclosed, that the Harvard corporation did not refuse to open Sanders Theatre to Mrs. Pankhurst until after the Harvard students themselves had declined



to allow the use of the hall controlled by them, the charge that the Harvard authorities have suppressed free speech seems a trifle ridiculous.

#### IF YOU WERE A MAN——

It is charged that Officer 1055 of the Boston police force, when, on the evening of September 25 he attempted to check Miss Margaret L. Foley from interrupting an open-air political rally, said to her, "O, if you were a man." The sentence was left incomplete, but it may be conjectured that the officer meant to say that, if Miss Foley were a man, he would have "run her in to the police station" without a moment's hesitation.

What actually happened on this occasion has been described as follows by Police Commissioner O'Meara:

Miss Foley was taken to Police Station 10 last Monday night to save her from a crowd of several thousand men and boys into which she had twice forced an automobile for the purpose of interrupting a speaker whom the crowd had gathered to hear. The police had a hard struggle to release her, forming a wedge to push through the crowd, which was so dense that sometimes they were lifted from their feet. While at the station, according to the report of the lieutenant in command, she stated that during the week she had been treated very considerably by all the police officers but complained that patrolman 1055 had unnecessarily pushed and punched her. This he denied on the spot, and in his denial he is sustained by two newspaper reporters and by other impartial witnesses. Her feeling against Patrolman 1055 is undoubtedly due to the fact that when she and other persons were on the steps of a railroad bridge for the purpose of climbing upon the roof of a fruit shop and she alone refused to desist, the patrolman was ordered by the sergeant to remove her by force if necessary, but force was not used."

This incident is a fresh illustration of the way in which the suffragettes, English and American, claim simultaneously the rights of men and the privileges of women. They want to be allowed to act like hoodlums and

#### RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

**IN 1909**  
In Arizona, Connecticut, Illinois, Nebraska and New Hampshire, municipal suffrage bills were defeated; in Kansas and Rhode Island presidential suffrage bills were defeated; in California, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, and Oklahoma, proposed suffrage amendments to the state constitutions either failed in committee or were defeated in one or both branches of the legislature; in Wisconsin, a proposal to give women full suffrage provided that it should be approved at a referendum passed the Senate but was defeated in the Assembly; in Connecticut a license suffrage bill was defeated.

**IN 1910**  
In Arizona and New Mexico, the constitutional conventions refused to incorporate woman suffrage in the constitutions which they framed, or to submit the question of woman suffrage to the voters as a separate proposition; in Oregon, a proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution was defeated by a majority of 23,795, the heaviest adverse majority given at any of the five elections at which the question has been submitted since 1884; in Oklahoma, a proposed suffrage amendment was defeated by a majority of 40,120; in South Dakota, a proposed suffrage amendment was defeated at the polls by a vote of 35,590 in favor to 57,709 opposed; in Kentucky, a school suffrage bill was defeated in the legislature; in Maryland, a state-wide suffrage bill was defeated, and a bill to confer municipal suffrage upon the women of Baltimore was indefinitely postponed in the House of Delegates by a vote of 67 to 24; in Massachusetts, a proposed constitutional amendment was adversely reported 7 to 4, and defeated in the House by a vote of 155 to 54, and in the Senate without a division; in New York, the Assembly, by a vote of 87 to 46, and the Senate by a vote of 30 to 16, refused to discharge the Judiciary Committee from consideration of a proposed suffrage amendment, so that the question might be brought to a vote; in Rhode Island, an adverse report upon a presidential suffrage bill was accepted by the Senate by a vote of 33 to 3 (yet in 1907, the Senate actually passed a similar bill and it was left to the House to defeat it); in Vermont, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated.

**IN 1911**  
In Connecticut, the Senate passed a municipal suffrage bill, but the House rejected it by a vote of 168 to 49.—almost four to one; yet in 1907, the adverse majority against a similar bill was only 30.

In Illinois, the House, May 17, voted, 71 to 68, not to suspend the rules to consider a bill passed by the Senate, March 23, which provided that each political district should have local option on woman suffrage.

In Indiana, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated.

In Iowa, the legislature defeated a resolution providing for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the constitution.

In Maine, a resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the constitution was defeated in the legislature.

In Massachusetts, the Committee on Constitutional Amendments reported, 8 to 3, "leave to withdraw" on a proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution. April 4, a motion to substitute the amendment for the adverse report was defeated in the House by a vote of 69 yeas to 161 nays; and in the Senate, a similar motion was defeated by a vote of 6 yeas to 31 nays. The Committee on Election Laws reported adversely, 11 to 6, on a bill to extend municipal suffrage to tax-paying women, and on a bill to allow all women in towns to vote on questions involving the expenditure of money; and the reports were accepted in both houses without debate.

In Michigan, a resolution providing for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the constitution was defeated in the legislature.

In Missouri, a bill to make women eligible as school directors was defeated in the legislature.

In Montana, the legislature rejected a resolution providing for the submission of a constitutional amendment.

In New Hampshire, the legislature defeated a municipal suffrage bill.

In New York, the Assembly, May 10, by a vote of 38 yeas to 90 nays, defeated a motion to request the Rules Committee to place on the calendar a resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the constitution. The Senate, July 12, in committee of the whole, refused, by a vote of 16 yeas to 17 nays, to advance a resolution providing for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the constitution. For the adoption of such a motion, 34 favorable votes would have been required.

In South Dakota, the House, by a vote of 26 to 69, refused to submit a proposed amendment to give full suffrage to women tax-payers.

In Vermont, the House, by a vote of 97 yeas to 126 nays, defeated a bill to give women the right to vote at local option elections.

hooligans and yet to be treated with respectful deference by the officers of the law. Whatever election practices may prevail in England, no American man or group of men would be permitted to drive an automobile into a crowd assembled at a political rally, for the purpose of interrupting the speakers and shouting, "Shame, shame," when something was said of which they did not approve. They would probably be dragged out of the automobile by the crowd before the officers could arrest them. But, if this did not happen, the officers would certainly not hesitate to stop their demonstrations by force, if necessary.

Miss Foley and her assistant hecklers appear to have been treated with great consideration, both in their demonstrations before the Boston

primaries and later when they trailed around after campaign speakers over the state. Their only grievance seems to be that, in this single instance the officers of the law kept them from carrying their demonstrations beyond the danger line.

#### NEITHER NEED NOR WANT IT (From the Louisville Evening Post, Oct. 25, 1911)

THE woman suffrage convention passes into history with the Evening Post still unconvinced as to the propositions that women either need or want the ballot. If they need the ballot for their own protection it is wise that they should have it even if they do not want it, but certainly the arguments to the effect that women need the ballot were not numerous or impressive.